

Serial No. 10/708,116

7

81044509

REMARKS

The drawings were objected with regards to Figures 3 and 7 being cut-off. The specification was objected to for the improper spelling of "which" in paragraph 18. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1,2,4-12 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue et al (WO/0183273 A1). Claims 3 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. in view of Sinnhuber (US 5,277,441).

Drawings

The drawings were objected to for having cut off figures 3 and 7 when submitted. Replacement drawing pages have been supplied.

Specification

The misspelling within the specification has been corrected.

Claims rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner finds confusion as to whether there is a separate cloth cover or if the airbag IS the internal pocket. The Examiner states that the specification, drawings, and claims all indicated this. The Applicant traverses this argument,. The specification, claims, and drawings make it clear that the cloth cover is an independent element from the airbag and the cloth cover FORMS an internal pocket. (paragraphs 6, 17, Figures 3,6,7, claims 1, 11, 18). The airbag is positioned within the internal pocket formed by the cloth cover. This is highly definite. An object cannot be placed within itself. The internal pocket and the airbag are independent entities. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and seeks reconsideration.

Claims rejected under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1,2,4-12 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue et al (WO/0183273 A1). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Inoue teaches the use of a triangular airbag to attempt to fill the window panel. The result is the necessity for inflating a large airbag assembly 51. The present invention, however, claims a cloth cover

Serial No. 10/708,116

8

81044509

assembly with an internal pocket and an airbag assembly within that pocket. The airbag assemblies expansion within the pocket during deployment extends the cloth cover into a deployed state covering the window. As a result, the present invention provides quick deployment without requiring extensive deployment air reserves. The structure claimed is different and operates in a different fashion. Furthermore, Inoue fails to teach the airbag expanding vertically upward from the beltline (WHILE within the inner pocket of a cloth cover) as claimed by the present invention. The Applicant submits that the present application claims structure and performance not taught by Inoue and therefore is patentably distinct. The Applicant, therefore, requests reconsideration.

Claims 3 and 13 rejected under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 3 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. in view of Sinnhuber (US 5,277,441). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Applicant incorporates the above arguments with regard to Inoue. In addition, however, the Applicant notes that the outboard airbag of the Sinnhuber reference is taught only to fill in the door panel, and is not taught to expand vertically up from the beltline as claimed by the present invention. An exterior airbag that inflates into the window-frame region is not taught or suggested by either reference alone or in combination. The Sinnhuber reference still only deploys airbags "within" the vehicle. Even those arguably mounted outboard of the window plane are still only deployed within the vehicle door. Thus neither reference, unlike the present invention, teaches a structure that is adept at pushing passengers back into the vehicle if partial extrusion has begun. The present invention claims a unique structure providing features not taught by either reference either alone or in combination. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration.

Serial No. 10/708,116

9

81044509

CONCLUSION

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his assistance. Applicant submits that all objections and rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments that would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas E. Donohue
Reg. No. 44,660
Artz & Artz, P.C.
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500
(248) 223-9522 (Fax)

Dated: July 14, 2006